```
IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
1
                  FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
 2
                           COLUMBIA DIVISION
 3
     UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
 4
                                        CR No. 3:14-cr-00430
             Plaintiff,
 5
                                       Columbia, SC
             VS.
 6
7
     RAYCO BETHEA,
             Defendant.
 8
                                        DATE: March 31, 2021
 9
              BEFORE THE HONORABLE JOSEPH F. ANDERSON, JR
10
               UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, PRESIDING
                            MOTION HEARING
11
12
    APPEARANCES:
13
14
    FOR THE PLAINTIFF:
15
     WILLIAM KENNETH WITHERSPOON
     US Attorneys Office
16
     1441 Main Street, Suite 500
     Columbia, SC 29201
17
18
     FOR THE DEFENDANT:
19
     ANDREW ROSS MACKENZIE
     Barrett and Mackenzie Law Firm
20
     100 Mills Avenue
     Greenville, SC 29605
2.1
22
    COURT REPORTER:
                                   KAREN V. ANDERSEN, RMR, CRR
                                    United States Court Reporter
23
                                    901 Richland Street
                                    Columbia, SC 29201
24
25
```

THE COURT: Mr. Witherspoon, please call the case 1 2 this morning. MR. WITHERSPOON: Your Honor, next case is United 3 States of America v. Rayco Bethea, Criminal Action No. 4 3:14-430. Mr. Bethea is present via video from Springfield, 5 Missouri. He's present. In the courtroom for him is Andrew 6 Ross Mackenzie, his attorney. Your Honor, we are here for a 7 resentencing in this case after the case was -- prior 8 sentence was vacated and sent back by the Fourth Circuit. THE COURT: I'm not sure it's necessary, but out of 10 abundance of caution, let me put this admonition on the 11 record. Pursuant to Rule 5(f) of the Federal Rules of 12 Criminal Procedure, the United States is ordered to produce 1.3 all exculpatory evidence to the defendant pursuant to Brady 14 v. Maryland and its progeny. Not doing so in a timely manner 15 may result in sanctions, including the exclusion of evidence, 16 adverse jury instructions, dismissal of charges, and contempt 17 proceedings. In accordance with the recently passed statute, 18 I will enter a written order memorializing this oral warning 19

Mr. Mackenzie, good morning.

to the Government.

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

MR. MACKENZIE: Good morning, Judge.

THE COURT: Mr. Bethea, can you hear me effectively?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I want to be sure before we begin, Mr.

Bethea, that you understand very clear that you have an absolute right to be present here in the courtroom for this resentencing proceeding. And, indeed, to that end, the Government had already made preparations, made plans and purchased a ticket to fly you here on a medical-type flight at pretty significant expense to the Government so that you could be present. And some time midweek last week, we received an information from your attorney, Mr. Mackenzie, that you preferred to stay there and participate in this proceeding by satellite communication so that you could stay there at the prison and get your dialysis treatments; is that correct? THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: All right. I want to be absolutely sure you understand that I can call this off right now and we can bring you here if you want to be here in person. But you have a right to participate by satellite if you wish to do so. Did you discuss this matter carefully with Mr.

Mackenzie?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor, I did.

THE COURT: All right. And did you consider your right to come here in person?

THE DEFENDANT: I told him I wanted to do video because of the girls when they came and got me, the places they took me at didn't have any dialysis treatment. So when

```
they took me to Oakland, they had to turn me back around and
1
    bring me back because they didn't have no dialysis. And then
 2
    again they said they had a place to go in Auburn, South
 3
     Carolina. They didn't have dialysis. So I just told Mr.
 4
    Mackenzie, hey, let's just do the video so I can make sure I
 5
     get my treatment, because I didn't want to go anywhere
 6
    without getting my treatment. So I asked if we could do a
 7
     waiver so we could do a live video.
 8
              THE COURT: I'm not sure I can go forward with this
     record being put on the record that he can't get dialysis if
10
    he's transported here. Is the marshal present?
11
              THE COURT DEPUTY: No, sir. But they told me that
12
     if he needed dialysis, they would take him to the emergency
1.3
     room and the emergency room would provide the dialysis, is
14
    what I was told by Chris Wolf of the U.S. Marshals office.
15
              THE COURT: Well, I've already been reversed once
16
    because of this very issue of whether the defendant could be
17
    here or not. And I don't want to get reversed twice on the
18
     same issue.
19
20
              Mr. Mackenzie (sic), we can get you here and we can
    get you dialysis -- I'm sorry. Mr. Bethea, we can get you
2.1
    here and we can get you dialysis.
22
23
              THE DEFENDANT: I just want to go on with the video,
    Your Honor.
24
              THE COURT: Mr. Bethea, there's a rule of criminal
```

```
procedure that says you must be present for all critical
1
 2
     stages of the proceedings against you. A resentencing is a
    critical stage. I just do not feel comfortable going forward
 3
    with you telling me that you consent to participate by
 4
    satellite but only because you can't get dialysis on the way
 5
    here and after you get here. You can receive your dialysis
 6
 7
    treatment. We can make that happen. And we will make it
 8
    happen.
              THE DEFENDANT: Yeah, I know. But, Your Honor, I
    prefer the satellite.
10
              THE COURT: I hear you saying that, but I am not
11
    going to get reversed twice in this case, Mr. Bethea. We can
12
    get you -- we can bring you here and get you dialysis
1.3
     treatment.
14
              THE DEFENDANT: I understand, Your Honor. But I
15
    would rather do it by satellite.
16
              THE COURT DEPUTY: Do you want me to call the
17
    marshals up here?
18
              THE COURT: Yes.
19
20
              THE COURT DEPUTY: Okay.
              THE COURT: Mr. Bethea, you said you had been
2.1
     transported somewhere before and you did not get dialysis
22
    when you were transported? What was that for? What was that
23
     transportation for?
24
              THE DEFENDANT: Well, the first one was in Oakland.
25
```

```
They took me. I think it was like a holdover. And they said
1
     they didn't have dialysis treatment. So they brought me
 2
    back.
 3
              THE COURT: Why were you being transported away from
 4
    your prison facility? That's my question.
 5
              THE DEFENDANT: I haven't the slightest idea, Your
 6
 7
    Honor.
              THE COURT DEPUTY: The marshal's on his way.
 8
              THE COURT: Mr. Mackenzie, I'm just concerned about
 9
    going forward on this record.
10
              MR. MACKENZIE: I understand.
11
              THE COURT: I do not want him to take an appeal
12
    telling the Fourth Circuit that I, by not ensuring the
1.3
    dialysis treatment, I caused him to forego his right to be
14
    present. That's basically what he told me. The marshal told
15
    me he would get dialysis treatment --
16
              MR. MACKENZIE: Yes, sir.
17
              THE COURT: -- while he was here.
18
              MR. MACKENZIE: I don't know. I don't know the
19
     circumstances. I don't know what was said to him, Your
20
    Honor.
            I'm sorry.
2.1
              THE COURT: Let's wait until the marshal gets here.
22
              THE COURT DEPUTY: This is Chris Wolfe.
23
              THE COURT: Mr. Wolfe, good morning.
24
              MR. WOLFE: Yes, sir, Your Honor.
25
```

```
THE COURT: I asked you to come up to the courtroom.
 1
    We are about to begin a criminal resentencing with Mr. Bethea
 2
    who is incarcerated at a federal prison facility. And last
 3
    week he, through his attorney, he signed a waiver of
 4
     appearance indicating he wanted to participate by satellite.
 5
    And as we began proceeding this morning, I asked Mr. Bethea
 6
    if it was with his full consent that we go forward with
 7
     satellite rather than inconference hearing. And he said yes,
 8
    but. He said, yes, I'm satisfied, but the reason I'm
     agreeing to do that is I can't get dialysis treatment while
10
     I'm being transported. And I'm concerned that on that
11
     record, I'm concerned about my ability to go forward.
12
              So can you tell me, would he get dialysis treatment
13
     if he were brought here?
14
              MR. WOLFE:
                           Yes, sir, he would get dialysis if he
15
    were brought here. And I would just ask him who would tell
16
    him that, because we would -- you know, in the means we would
17
     transport him, we would have two deputies fly commercially,
18
    pick him up, bring him here, and we had all the logistics
19
    worked out.
20
                         How long would the flight take to get
2.1
              THE COURT:
    him here?
22
                         Round-trip, it was about eight hours.
23
              MR. WOLFE:
                         I'm talking about one way.
24
              THE COURT:
                         One way with the layovers and transfer,
25
              MR. WOLFE:
```

```
probably about eight hours.
1
 2
              THE COURT: All right. And so I'm just assuming he
     could get a dialysis treatment at the prison. And then you
 3
     could have him in Columbia, South Carolina, eight hours
 4
     later.
 5
              MR. WOLFE: Yes, your Honor.
 6
              THE COURT: And he gets dialysis three days a week,
 7
     so you should have plenty of time to get him a second
 8
     treatment after he gets here?
              MR. WOLFE: Yes, sir, that's correct.
10
              THE COURT: Mr. Mackenzie, I think we've got to
11
     adjourn this hearing and get him here.
12
              MR. MACKENZIE: I will follow your instruction,
13
14
     Judge.
              THE COURT: Mr. Witherspoon, does the Government
15
     have a position?
16
              MR. WITHERSPOON: We do not, Judge.
17
              THE COURT: All right. We will reschedule this
18
     hearing. How much lead time do we need to get plane flight
19
     rescheduled and so forth?
20
              MR. WOLFE: Your Honor, we will do it as quickly as
2.1
     the Court would like to schedule it, couple weeks advance
22
     notice.
23
              THE COURT: We will probably schedule a month down
24
     the road.
25
```

```
MR. WOLFE: That would be great.
 1
 2
              THE COURT: Mr. Mackenzie, I know you drove down
    here from Greenville this morning. We appreciate your
 3
     involvement in this case. I just think the safe thing to do
 4
    is get him here. If he says he wants to be here and he would
 5
    be here but for the dialysis treatment, it's not a problem.
 6
    We can get him dialysis while he's here.
 7
              Is it a commercial flight or a private flight or
 8
    what type flight?
 9
              MR. WOLFE: We will be flying him commercially, and
10
    then both ways here and there.
11
              THE COURT DEPUTY: What days does he have his
12
     treatments?
1.3
              THE COURT: Mr. Bethea, what days do you get your
14
    dialysis treatment, what days of the week?
15
              THE DEFENDANT: Monday, Wednesday and Friday, Your
16
    Honor.
17
              THE COURT: All right. So can we make arrangements
18
    to pick him up on a Monday as soon as he finishes his Monday
19
    treatment?
20
              MR. WOLFE: We will work the transportation around
2.1
    his dialysis.
22
23
              THE DEFENDANT: I mean, I'm sorry.
              MR. WOLFE: He was doing it Tuesday, Thursday,
24
     Saturday.
25
```

THE DEFENDANT: Tuesday, Thursday, and Saturday. 1 I'm sorry. That was my --2 MR. WOLFE: That's why we were bringing him here on 3 a Monday. 4 THE COURT: Let's just go back to that. We will 5 send out notice about a month down the road to reschedule the 6 hearing with Mr. Bethea present. 7 All right. Well, I'm sorry that we had to get 8 everybody here and, Mr. Mackenzie, you had to drive down from Greenville, but we will reschedule it. 10 MR. WITHERSPOON: It looked like Mr. Bethea was 11 raising his hands. 12 THE COURT: Mr. Bethea, do you want to say something 13 else? 14 THE DEFENDANT: Yeah. I didn't mean to say it that 15 way. I was just letting you know what had happened. But I 16 did want the video, Your Honor. I didn't mean to put that on 17 the record. I was just telling you what happened. 18 THE COURT: Let's take a recess and let Mr. 19 Mackenzie talk with his client. And, Mr. Mackenzie, he seems 20 to be wanting to back peddle now from what he told me 2.1 earlier. I heard him tell me earlier he was consenting to 22 this video because he couldn't get dialysis treatment. And 23 on that record, I don't think I could go forward, because he 24 can get dialysis treatment. And the rule of criminal 25

```
procedure applicable here says he's supposed to be here.
1
                                                                So
 2
     let's clear the courtroom and --
              THE COURT DEPUTY: He's got means to talk to him.
 3
              THE COURT: We will take a recess and just tell me
 4
     when you are ready to resume. And I will let you discuss
 5
     both ways with him and decide what he wants to do.
 6
 7
              (Whereupon, recess transpired.)
              THE COURT: Let's go back on the record in the case
 8
     of United States of America v. Bethea.
              Mr. Mackenzie, what is your client's position at
10
     this time?
11
              MR. MACKENZIE: Judge Anderson, during the recess, I
12
     talked with Mr. Bethea again about his rights concerning
1.3
     presence at resentencing. And he is now prepared to say --
14
     what he tells me, what he meant to say is that he understands
15
     that dialysis is available today if he were here. It will be
16
     available in the future if this case needs to be rescheduled.
17
     But that under any circumstances, he wishes to waive his
18
     right to be personally present and wants to do this by video.
19
              And let me just further reiterate, this was all his
20
            This notion of doing this sentencing by video was
2.1
     broached by Mr. Bethea. He brought it up.
22
23
              THE COURT: Right.
              MR. MACKENZIE: That's when I contacted the Court.
24
     And y'all put it in motion. I have discussed this with him
25
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

more than once, Your Honor. He signed the written waiver. think he understands that dialysis will, in fact -- I believe he's prepared to state that he understands that dialysis is available today. It will be available in the future. But that, nevertheless, he wishes to waive his right to be personally present. THE COURT: All right. Mr. Bethea, can you hear me? THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. THE COURT: All right. Mr. Bethea, I just want to make a very clear record here. Mr. Mackenzie, your attorney, told me that we made arrangements to have you transported here. The plane ticket had been purchased. Arrangements had been made to pick you up at your facility and bring you here as expeditiously as possible. And some time mid-week last week, you contacted Mr. Mackenzie and requested you be allowed to participate by satellite communication; is that correct? THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. THE COURT: All right. And I want to be very clear now. If we were to bring you here, we would, in fact, have dialysis treatment available for you as needed at a very reputable medical facility. I want to be sure you understand that factual statement. Are we clear? THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor. Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: Knowing that, Mr. Mackenzie says you

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

still would like to go forward this morning with a satellite conference as we have set up, waiving your right to be personally present at the hearing; is that correct? THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: All right. And you discussed the pros and cons of doing this with Mr. Mackenzie, have you? THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: Is it your decision, your personal decision to stay right there at your facility where you are this morning and participate by satellite at this resentencing hearing? THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: All right. I would note for the record that we seem to have very good quality audio and video, much better than is normally the case with these type conferences. Have you been able to see and hear me clearly, Mr. Bethea? THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: All right. Mr. Mackenzie, do you know of any reason why we should not proceed this morning? MR. MACKENZIE: No, Your Honor. THE COURT: I find that Mr. Bethea has freely and voluntarily waived his right to be personally present for this resentencing hearing. His presence is normally required by the Rules of Criminal Procedure. But we have a written

1.3

2.1

waiver that was filed with the clerk on the 25th of this month signed by both the defendant and his attorney. That's part of the record in this case. I've conducted an extensive colloquy with Mr. Bethea. And he tells me now that after our brief recess to let him confer with counsel, he now understands fully that if he were to be transported here by a commercial aircraft carrier, it would be about an eight-hour flight and he would not miss any dialysis treatments en route here or back to the facility. And for that reason, I'm prepared to go forward with the resentencing this morning.

All right. As Mr. Witherspoon indicated, we are here for a resentencing following a reversal and remand of the Fourth Circuit of the earlier sentence imposed in this case. The earlier was a life sentence that was issued before the First Step Act because the court's recent activity in vacating and resentencing the defendant caused the sentence to occur after the First Step Act, the provisions of that statute apply, which has a significant modification of the potential sentence in Mr. Bethea's case.

After the mandate was received from the Fourth Circuit, the United States Probation Office has prepared a new presentence report. It was filed with the clerk on 21st of March of this year. Copies have been furnished to both the Government and the defendant. The addendum indicates that neither side has objection to the factual findings or

```
guideline application in the revised presentence report.
1
              Mr. Witherspoon, have you had enough time to read
 2
    over the presentence report?
 3
              MR. WITHERSPOON: We have, Judge.
 4
              THE COURT: Is it correct?
 5
              MR. WITHERSPOON: The Government has no objections.
 6
              THE COURT: Very good. Mr. Mackenzie, have you had
 7
     enough time to review the presentence report and discuss it
 8
     carefully with Mr. Bethea?
 9
              MR. MACKENZIE: Yes.
10
              THE COURT: Probation indicates that you do not have
11
     any objections to this new report; is that correct?
12
              MR. MACKENZIE: Yes, sir.
1.3
              THE COURT: Mr. Bethea, let me speak to you, sir.
14
    Have you had enough time to read over this revised
15
    presentence report prepared by the probation office and
16
    discuss it thoroughly with your attorney?
17
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
18
              THE COURT: You just heard Mr. Mackenzie tell me
19
     that you do not have any objection to the factual matters or
20
     quidelines calculations contained in this revised presentence
2.1
     report. Is that a correct statement?
22
23
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
              THE COURT: Very good. I will adopt the new
24
    presentence report filed with the clerk on the 21st of this
25
```

month. 1 2 THE COURT DEPUTY: On the 21st? THE COURT: I'm sorry. March the 11th. Thank you, 3 Ms. Floyd. Filed on the 11th of this month. Just for the 4 record, it's dated March the 11th, 2021. I will adopt this 5 without objection as the Court's findings for the purpose of 6 sentencing in this case. That means that we are looking at 7 the following statutory and quideline provisions upon 8 resentencing. Under the statute, there's a mandatory minimum of ten years and a potential maximum of life. 10 Under the statute, supervised release is at least 11 five years. Probation is not provided for. The fine could 12 be up to \$10 million. And the special assessment is \$100. 1.3 Under the advisory quideline provisions, the total offense 14 level is 32. The Criminal History Category is III. The 15 defendant is not eligible for straight probation under Zone D 16 of the guideline table. The advisory sentencing range is 151 17 to 180 months incarceration. 18 THE CLERK: 188. 19 THE COURT: I'm sorry. Thank you. 151 to 188 20 months of imprisonment, advisory only. The supervised 2.1 release period is five years. The fine was not calculated 22 due to inability to pay. There's no restitution to 23

Have I correctly stated the guideline and statutory

calculate. And a special assessment is \$100.

2.4

25

```
provisions, Mr. Witherspoon?
1
 2
              MR. WITHERSPOON: Yes, Your Honor.
              THE COURT: Mr. Mackenzie?
 3
              MR. MACKENZIE: Yes, Your Honor.
 4
              THE COURT: Mr. Witherspoon, I will be glad to hear
 5
     from the Government on resentencing.
 6
 7
              MR. WITHERSPOON: Judge, the Government filed a
    motion for upward variance. And we also filed a sentencing
 8
    memorandum to go along with our upward variance motion. I
    would state for the record that we stand by our sentencing
10
    memorandum and the reasons for the upward variance.
11
              THE COURT: Now, at first you requested more of an
12
    upward variance than you did in your recently filed
1.3
    memorandum yesterday; is that correct?
14
              MR. WITHERSPOON:
                                That's after going back and
15
     reviewing it, I did reduce the amount. Initially in my
16
     initial motion for upward variance, I sought a three-level
17
    upward variance to Criminal History Category III, offense
18
     level 35, which gave a range of 210 to 262 months.
19
              Yesterday, Judge, I filed a sentencing memorandum
20
    where I was only seeking a one-level increase, one Criminal
2.1
    History Category level from a 3 to a 4. Same offense level,
22
    which gives it a range of 168 to 210 months.
23
              And, Judge, I can go through the reasons, however
24
     the Court wants to proceed.
25
```

1.3

2.1

THE COURT: I read your memorandum. Anything you want to add, I would be glad to hear you.

MR. WITHERSPOON: No, sir. Judge, I think that pretty much lays it out. This is a very unusual case as the Court has said. Aside from the remand because of First Step Act and all, Mr. Bethea was given an opportunity initially to lessen his sentence from a mandatory life down to a 20-year sentence, and then even further. But he refused to take that opportunity, Judge. Even though he was out on bond and was supposed to be working with the Government to help lessen his sentence, because he was out on bond because of his being on the kidney transplant list, he continued to cook crack cocaine for other drug dealers after his wife and children left the home.

His drug weights, Judge, as in the presentence report, roughly was 16 kilos of cocaine and little more than a half kilo of crack cocaine. And that does not take into consideration the amount of crack cocaine that he cooked from February when he was arrested until August when he was sentenced, which I calculated roughly more than two kilos of crack cocaine that was cooked by Mr. Bethea. Even knowing he was facing a mandatory life sentence, he continued to violate the law.

When you look at the elements of 3553(a), I think -- I represent, Judge, that that -- his guidelines, the elements

1.3

2.1

of the 3553(a) reflect that it should be a higher sentence based upon the nature and circumstances of the offense and the characteristics of Mr. Bethea, the need for the sentence imposed and the seriousness of the law. He knew he was facing a life sentence, but he continued to violate the law even though he knew he was facing this life sentence. And the Government was taking every step possible to help him to remain on the kidney transplant list, to get a kidney, and to help himself so he wouldn't face this sentence.

Neither the guidelines nor his criminal history took into account this action. For those reasons, Judge, we ask that you increase his -- the Criminal History Category from III to IV.

In addition, Judge, in the alternative, as I stated in my memo, he did not get two criminal history category points for one of the convictions he had, because he had committed one offense in April. He committed another offense in May. They were consolidated for sentencing on the same day. And under the guidelines, they only count as one sentence.

As I cited in my memo, there's case law that indicates that does not accurately reflect his criminal history category. So I would ask the Court to move from a criminal history category of III to a criminal history category of IV and still sentence him at level 32, which is

the new guideline range.

1.3

2.1

I note in Mr. Mackenzie's memo, sentencing memorandum, he says that that is not allowed because the loss of the three levels acceptance of responsibility takes into account for that. But in the *Bolton* case that I cited in my memo directly on point, indicates even if he lost acceptance of responsibility, the Court still can enhance him for committing an offense while he's out on bond for that criminal activity. I think the *Bolton* case is directly on point on that issue.

And I think the *Hines* case is directly on point on the issue of the two convictions happening on different days, sentencing on the same day, not receiving criminal history category points, again, is directly on point.

THE COURT: You've got case authority for both of your points that you argue?

MR. WITHERSPOON: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Let me ask you this, Mr. Witherspoon.

As you know, this is a preliminary resentencing. And the

Fourth Circuit in recent years has been particularly

interested in the defendant's behavior while incarcerated.

And there's one case -- I don't know the name of it. I can't remember it.

MR. WITHERSPOON: It was McDonald, I think it was.

THE COURT: One case where Justice Gregory said this

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

defendant thought he was in prison for life. He had no idea that a retroactive application of the sentencing laws would come into play. And notwithstanding that, he still was -- he behaved himself. He did not, you know, antagonize the guards every day of the week, so to speak. And so here we do have a defendant who was -- thought he was in jail for life, and he has a pretty good record. He only has two relatively minor violations, one for inappropriate use of a -- inappropriate e-mail, for which he lost e-mail privileges for 30 days, and inappropriate use of another inmate's cell phone, for which he was disciplined mildly. I didn't think any inmates had cell phones. How could he use another inmate's cell phone. MR. WITHERSPOON: It's not inmate's cell phone. It's inmate number. The way I understand the prison system is, I am given a specific number that I can use on the phones to make calls. Therefore, whenever my number is used, it can reflect it's being used by William Witherspoon. THE COURT: Inappropriate use of another inmate's number, not cell phone? MR. WITHERSPOON: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: Both of those are relatively minor. MR. WITHERSPOON: The difference is in that case, as I remember it, is that defendant had been incarcerated for a long period of time before the change. Here, it looks like Mr. Bethea has only been incarcerated for five years, maybe

five years. 1 2 THE COURT: Right. MR. WITHERSPOON: And a lot of that has been while 3 we've been going through the appellate decision about the FSA 4 and the need for --5 THE COURT: That's a good point. He had been in 6 7 prison for last five years, and there have been a lot of activity, a lot of new law coming down on sentencing. So I 8 quess the argument I was making earlier is, has a little bit less force because of that. 10 MR. WITHERSPOON: I think if you look, Judge, he 11 has -- when you go through again the elements of the 3553(a) 12 as far as helping vocational and educational training, he did 1.3 not have a GED. And as a result of going through the Bureau 14 of Prisons, he's working toward getting his GED, which is 15 another element that the Court takes into consideration in 16 3553(a) factors. There is hope that he will someday, some 17 point get a kidney transplant which will alleviate dialysis, 18 which will allow him to work. In his memo he even says now 19 he's working in the Bureau of Prisons. So he could get 20

He's no longer looking at the life sentence. His guidelines are substantially less today than they were in

vocational training that would help him when he's released

from prison, which would then allow him to help support his

2.1

22

23

24

25

family.

1.3

2.1

2014, 2015. And so I think you take all that into consideration. I think that's when you weigh those and when you look at those, I still think, Judge, that the 168 to 210 months is sufficient but not greater than necessary.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Mackenzie, I will be glad to hear from you.

MR. MACKENZIE: Thank you, Judge Anderson. I just want to reiterate about Mr. Bethea's medical condition. It's well documented in the presentence report, but he does suffer from lupus, kidney disease, end-stage renal failure, high blood pressure, among other elements.

Lupus is immunocompromised condition, which makes him more susceptible to other conditions. He's in need of a kidney transplant. He does dialysis three days a week. He has a fistula in his arm that makes that easier to do. He's on multiple medications.

He does have a prior record, Your Honor. His prior convictions no longer qualify for an 851 enhancement under the First Step Act.

I also noted in my sentencing memorandum that he was never considered a career offender under the sentencing guidelines even at his initial sentencing. And the reason I raise that is, it just seems a little inconsistent to me that here we have a man who was serving a mandatory life sentencing and wasn't even considered a career offender under

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

the guidelines. In spite of his prior record, he does not have any convictions for a crime of violence or use of force or anything like that.

He has done well in prison. His disciplinary record is attached to my sentencing memo. It's one page. I don't know that I've ever seen one that short. It lists only one incident where he improperly used a telephone to call his wife. And he was sanctioned for that. He tells me, although we don't have a record of it, there was another recent incident where he sent an improper e-mail. I believe it was to another inmate. And he was sanctioned for that. And those are his only disciplinary violations. He's participated in multiple education courses. Your Honor, those records are attached to his compassionate release That's in the record. He's taking multiple petition. education courses to better his education and improve himself.

And, yes, I understand your point that even though he was facing a life sentence, he took advantage of these opportunities. I would say that's still relevant. He certainly didn't do badly while he was in prison.

I understand the upward variances that are requested by the Government. The first one having to do with the continued criminal activity after he was on bond, after his guilty plea before his initial sentencing. At the initial

1.3

2.1

sentencing, he lost his acceptance points at Your Honor's direction because of his continued criminal activity. And that result -- that results -- first of all, his initial guideline range was 108 to 135 months. With the loss of acceptance points, his range is 151 to 188 months. That's his present guideline range. That is a difference of at least 43 months, at least. In other words, that's a difference of at least three and a half years.

If Your Honor sentences him under the guidelines, he is already going to serve an additional three and a half years because of that continued criminal activity. And I would respectfully take the position that may be enough to address that activity.

THE COURT: Well, I don't want to argue with you, but we have a lot of defendants who lose the credit for acceptance of responsibility because they tested positive for drugs or shoplifting or something. But he had pretty bad conduct, pretty bad conduct involved here.

MR. MACKENZIE: But I would respectfully say, he's not escaping punishment. He's facing an additional three and a half years at least under the guidelines. I understand the Bolton case. I've read the Bolton case that's cited by the Government. This is a serious case. I am not trying to downplay it. But this Bolton case is a far more serious case than what's going on here. In that case there was

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

allegations of unlawful possession of firearms, stolen firearms, 924(c) convictions. That was a little bit different than what's going on here.

I understand the Government's position, their motion for variance based on his criminal history category. His criminal history category is not understated. quidelines, you know, two of his prior sentences were consolidated under the guidelines because that's the rule. That's what the guidelines say you are supposed to do. is routine. That is uniform in every case where the issue comes up, the guidelines say that's what you do. In every case for every defendant in every presentence report, in every federal district in this country that is the rule. That is what you are supposed to do. So if we are not going to do that in this case, that raises a question in my mind, does that create a sentencing disparity issue there? Because the guidelines say that is the norm. And if we are not going to do that in this case, is he being treated fairly like all the other defendants in the country?

Seems to me that if the presentence report had not consolidated those cases, that would be grounds for a variance. But the presentence report, the guidelines were calculated correctly. I don't know that that's a grounds for an upward variance. And I would point out that he did end up serving six months for those prior convictions. He later

1.3

2.1

violated his probation and ended up serving six months. So, again, I don't know that he's escaped punishment.

You know, Congress with the First Step Act said -they clearly indicated they want to reduce the sentences for
people like Mr. Bethea and people who are in similar
positions to Mr. Bethea. They have clearly made that -- said
that. And the Fourth Circuit has confirmed that and said,
yes, not only that, but the First Step Act applies to this
case.

And Congress, it was Congress's intent to reduce these old Draconian sentences from the 1980s and 1990s. It seems to me that a lot of these resentencing issues that are coming up all seem to be addressed by the guidelines. You know, all the circumstances in this case seem to point us back to the sentencing guidelines. And that's what we are asking for. We are asking for the low end under the guidelines, 151 months. That is a sentence that's reasonable and sufficient. You know, that's 12 1/2 years. That is not a short sentence. Again, Mr. Bethea is not in any way escaping punishment.

And I'm also glad to address the compassionate release issue when you are ready.

THE COURT: I think we should take that up second after we impose the resentence.

MR. MACKENZIE: Yes, sir.

```
THE COURT: I think I earlier declined a request to
 1
     appoint counsel, but I'm going to appoint counsel today to --
 2
              MR. MACKENZIE: I'm glad to address that.
 3
              THE COURT: Representing him on that second phase of
 4
     that proceeding. All right.
 5
              MR. MACKENZIE: Yes, sir.
 6
 7
              THE COURT: Anything further?
              MR. MACKENZIE: No, sir, Your Honor.
 8
              THE COURT: Mr. Bethea, can you hear me, sir?
 9
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
10
              THE COURT: All right. You have a right to make any
11
     statement that you wish at this time before the Court decides
12
     upon a sentence in your case. So this is your chance to
1.3
           I will be glad to hear anything you want to say.
14
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor. I have a letter I
15
    want to read, if that's okay.
16
              THE COURT: Yes, sir. Now, read slowly. The court
17
     reporter has to take down what you say. And frequently when
18
    people read something, they speed up and talk fast. And it's
19
20
    hard on the court reporter. So please read slowly.
              THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, also, in case they miss,
2.1
     I know my lawyer has a copy as well.
22
23
              THE COURT: All right. Very good. We will give a
    copy to the court reporter then. That's good. Go ahead.
24
              THE DEFENDANT: All right. Honorable Judge Anderson
25
```

2.1

Jr, it is a privilege and an honor to have an opportunity to share these words with you in the court. The years of incarceration I have experienced have actually been some form of blessing in my life. I don't mean to infer that I am enjoying prison or the time spent away from my family and those I love isn't hard. I just want to demonstrate that this time has been beneficial in bringing about change in my attitudes and my actions. I know this is a common refrain among those seeking leniency from the Court, but please allow me a few moments to express how I'm not using cliches for speaking on the reality of change that has occurred in my heart and life.

Judge Anderson, my past is littered with a series of unfortunate incidents and poor decisions which led me to my current set of circumstances. The missteps of my past I have come to understand were not based on effects in my character or errors in my thinking. Taking the drug classes I was offered and living on the unit where the drug counselors and facilitators have their office allowed me to assess and analyze the information that has brought to my infamy and change. Your Honor, I am not a bad person. I just made bad decisions based on bad information. This doesn't absolve me of guilt or responsibility for my past criminal behavior. I accept both. But it does explain the difficulty I have experienced in the past in trying to change. That difficulty

2.1

has been removed. The clarity I have gained through the hard work of brutal self-analysis and introspection is a cherished possession.

In addition, the institutional program coupled with the substance abuse prevention classes I have completed and created a reservoir of knowledge I can draw from to my God of critical thinking and decision-making process. No longer do I allow the misstep or misleading to cloud the truth and corrupt my decision-making. I can see the obstacle in my path. And more importantly, I can visualize the proper steps to take to maneuver around those so-called obstacles and continue on the proper path. This is not a jailhouse change but a life-altering understanding that will assure not just the end of my criminal thinking and behavior, but also allow me to be a constructive member of my community, a responsible member of my family, and a loving father to my children, and a loving husband to my wife.

No one has the power to change the past, but all humans possess the capacity to change within themselves. I have often heard it said, when you know better, you do better. Well, Your Honor, I can honestly say I now know better. I owe it to my family to do better. I owe it to my children to do better. I owe it to my wife who has been by my side throughout this incarceration to do better. Most importantly, I owe it to myself to do so and be better. I

1.3

2.1

owe it to myself to come out of the delusions of drug dealing and criminal lifestyle and become the man I was meant to be, a man of honor, dignity, respect and value.

I had begun the process while still within these walls even though Springfield allows me to remain medically unassigned to a job placement due to my medical condition, need for dialysis. I've had chosen to maintain work detail and manifest the process of change in my actions and not just my record. It is my sincere intention to redeem myself by living as an agent of responsibility, maturity and growth where once I lived an an agent of pain, suffering and destruction. I'm doing -- I am doing and will continue to do everything in my new-found understanding and power to continue to affect change in my life.

I am appealing to this Court for another opportunity at freedom. I don't claim to have earned another chance. I just claim to be worth one. I accept that criminal conduct must be punished. But the greater system of justice ever devised by man always sought to define the demands for misdeeds to be punished with a devine attributes of mercy.

I believe both aspects of justice can be satisfied in my situation with a grant of compassionate release.

Unprecedented times call for unprecedented actions. COVID-19 is a daily reality currently at Springfield, Missouri, especially for dialysis patients. Congress has empowered you

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

to tip the justice with compassion in these types of circumstances. I thank you, Judge Anderson, and the Court for your time and your thoughtful consideration. THE COURT: All right. Thank you, sir. Mr. Mackenzie, anything further? You have a written copy? you could give it to the court reporter, I would appreciate it. MR. WITHERSPOON: Your Honor, for the record, I think that was document entry level 101-3, was the letter. THE COURT: It's already in the record. MR. WITHERSPOON: That was sent with his compassionate release. THE COURT: Right. Anything in reply by the Government? MR. WITHERSPOON: Yes, sir, Judge. Mr. Mackenzie and Mr. Bethea tend to highlight his medical conditions of lupus, kidney disease, with the fistula and the medical -multiple medications that he's received. I would point out to the Court, he had those same conditions when he was selling drugs. They did not preclude him from being involved in the drug dealing, cooking crack cocaine. And what gets me, I guess, is he was doing it in his family's house. Because he was on home detention, he couldn't leave. He would wait until his wife and children leave the house, bring in drug dealers into his family's home, and cook crack

cocaine.

1.3

2.1

He was never a career offender, but he was serving a life sentence. And he's not the only person that that has happened to prior to the First Step Act where possession of crack cocaine, PWID crack cocaine was pled down to possession, which would preclude a person from being a career offender, but would still be considered as a felony drug offense, which could cause the Court to sentence a life sentence.

Mr. Bethea's sentence, the request I ask, is a 40-month sentence, increase of 40 months. Mr. Mackenzie says that was a -- three and a half years was what the *Bolton* case says. So we are in the same boat with the criminal activity while out on bond, no acceptance of responsibility. It's the same amount that we are seeking.

The sentencing guidelines, Judge, as the Court has said, is not the sentence. The Court -- this Court has to determine that the guidelines are applicable, that they are appropriate, that they are correct. And then the Court can make the decision where the sentencing goes. The Court can go up or the Court can go down. You just have to start at the sentencing guidelines. And for Mr. Mackenzie to say that the sentencing guidelines is where you are stuck at is not true. We have defendants come in all the time asking this Court for downward departures or downward variances for one

1.3

2.1

reason or another. Under Mr. Mackenzie's position, you wouldn't be able to do that. But the Fourth Circuit and the Supreme Court and Congress have given the Court the discretion, starting at the guidelines, to make that determination where it should be sentenced.

And we are not saying that he's escaping punishment. We are not saying that. We are just saying that, Judge, the punishment in this case should be higher than what the quidelines are in this case.

Mr. Bethea talks about a substance abuse. But when you look in the presentence report, paragraph 93, Mr. Bethea talks about substance abuse. When you look in the presentence report, page 28, paragraph 93, he wasn't an abuser of drugs. He was just selling drugs for cash.

He also in that same paragraph went to LRADAC, which as the Court knows is a drug treatment organization here. So he's had drug treatment. Even after that, he continued to sell drugs in this case for a number of years.

We again, Judge, think his guidelines under the factors of 3553(a) that we've cited in our sentencing memorandum and/or an alternative because his guidelines under represent his criminal activity, that the one-level increase to 168 to 210 months is a reasonable sentence in this area.

 $\,$ And I will point out to the Court, his guidelines now of 151 to 188, the 168 to 210 primarily encompasses that

same guideline level.

1.3

2.1

THE COURT: Some overlap there.

MR. WITHERSPOON: Tremendous overlap there. So, again, we would ask the Court for upward variance.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Witherspoon, you've done your usual good job of forcibly advocating the Government's position here. The defendant probably deserves an upward variance, but I'm going to respectfully disagree in this case and sentence within the guidelines. But I am going to sentence at the very high end of the guideline level.

Having calculated and considered the advisory sentencing guidelines and having also considered the relevant statutory sentencing factors of Section 3553(a) of Title 18, it is the judgment of the Court that the defendant, Rayco Bethea, is hereby committed to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons to be imprisoned for a term of 188 months, which is the top of the applicable guideline range.

I find the defendant does not have the ability to pay a fine, therefore, the fine is waived. I previously imposed a mandatory special assessment of \$100. Probation informs me that had been paid in full. Upon his release from incarceration, the defendant shall be placed on supervised release for a term of five years. Within 72 hours of his release from custody of the Bureau of Prisons, the defendant shall report in person to the probation office in the

district to which he is released.

1.3

2.1

While on supervised release, the defendant shall comply with the mandatory and standard conditions of supervision that are all set out in Title 18 of the United States Code, Section 3583(d), and the sentencing guidelines special conditions of supervised release.

I'm required to put my reasons on the record.

Special conditions of supervised release 1 through 9 and 13 serve the statutory sentencing purposes of public protection and rehabilitation pursuant to Section 3553(a)(2)(C) and (D).

Standard conditions of supervisions 10 and 12 serve the statutory sentencing purpose of public protection pursuant to Section 3553(a)(2)(C) of Title 18.

Standard condition of supervision 11 ensures that the defendant does not engage in activities that may potentially conflict with the other conditions of supervision and that may pose risk to the defendant's probation officer.

Now, there's a recent decision in the Fourth Circuit that says I can't incorporate by reference the standard conditions. And usually we have from the probation office the reference to the specific guidelines that sets out those standard conditions. And I don't see it here. Can you help me with that?

PROBATION OFFICER: Your Honor, I believe what you are referencing to is the conditions that you just read over

to go through conditions 1 through 13. 1 2 THE COURT: 1 through 13. PROBATION OFFICER: And those are also incorporated 3 in reference within the presentence report towards the latter 4 part --5 THE COURT: Those special conditions are already 6 7 included in the presentence report and incorporated by reference. Mr. Mackenzie, you read over those special 8 conditions? MR. MACKENZIE: Yes, Your Honor. 10 THE COURT: Has your client read those special 11 conditions? 12 MR. MACKENZIE: Yes, sir, I reviewed it with him. 1.3 THE COURT: Very good. I put on the record my 14 reasons for imposing those special conditions. 15 In addition, the defendant shall comply with the 16 following special condition -- I'm sorry. I've been saying 17 special. Standard. I misspoke. I should have said 13 18 standard conditions. In addition, there's one special 19 condition, the defendant must submit to substance abuse 20 testing to determine if he's used a prohibited substance. 2.1 must contribute to the cost of this program in an amount 22 determined reasonable by the probation officer's sliding 23 scale for services. If applicable, he shall cooperate in 2.4 securing payment from any third-party, such as insurance or 25

1.3

2.1

Medicaid. This special condition is based upon the defendant's admitted substance abuse and history as detailed in the presentence report.

Now, Mr. Bethea, you've signed a plea agreement containing a partial waiver of your appeal rights in this case. Only in very narrow circumstance may a defendant who has waived his appeal in this fashion nevertheless attempt to pursue an appeal. You should discuss with Mr. Mackenzie in detail whether you have any grounds for an appeal and whether an appeal would be in your best interest or not.

If you wish to appeal and cannot afford an attorney, the court would appoint one for you. If you wish to appeal, you would have to file your notice of appeal within 14 days from the day the judgment order containing your sentence is filed with the clerk.

I'm required to put on the record my reasons for imposing this particular sentence. First of all, as required by Section 3553(a), I have considered the nature and circumstances of the offense. In this case, we have a defendant who has pled guilty to conspiracy to possess with intent to distribute 5 kilograms or more of a mixture of substance containing cocaine and 280 grams or more of a mixture or substance containing cocaine base.

This conviction arose from an investigation of the so-called "Antonio Williams drug distribution ring," also

1.3

2.1

known by the nickname Dollar Bill. The investigation began in April 2011 with the interception of wire and electronic communications on cellular telephones used by Mr. Williams. That wiretap information revealed that Williams was a multi-kilogram cocaine dealer in the Batesburg-Leesville area of South Carolina who was supplying a large number of conspirators with cocaine, including the defendant in this case, Mr. Bethea.

Subsequent to Mr. Williams's arrest, he was interviewed and provided historical information regarding Mr. Bethea's illegal drug activity. Another defendant, William Holloway, also provided information regarding Mr. Bethea's drug activity.

As indicated by Mr. Witherspoon, he was ultimately held responsible for 16 kilograms of cocaine and one-half of a kilogram of crack cocaine. Both of those are serious offenses in this Court's opinion.

Historically in the District of South Carolina, we are in the top five districts in the country in terms of crack cocaine prosecutions. So suffice it to say that crack cocaine distribution is a serious and pervasive crime in South Carolina. A lot of people become addicted to this substance because of people like Mr. Bethea who are providing it to them.

Regarding the history and characteristics of the

1.3

2.1

defendant, Mr. Bethea has a criminal history, which we might consider to be moderate. It's in the mid-point, so to speak. It includes prior convictions for forgery, burglary, third-degree grand larceny, possession of crack cocaine, possession with intent to distribute crack cocaine, first offense, possession of crack cocaine, first offense, possession of crack cocaine, first offense, and then some traffic violations involving failure to stop for blue lights and a driver's license restriction. He also has many convictions for minor traffic offenses that don't bear mention here.

I do note, as the Government, I believe, points out, in spite of these convictions in the past for serious convictions, Mr. Bethea spent very little time of incarceration. He was given suspended sentences with probation. And in one of the situations, violated probation, and then only received a sentence of six months, which was combined with another conviction at the same time.

I'm aware of his medical problems. His history of lupus and kidney problems is well-documented in the record. He also has high blood pressure, acid reflux, a 14 percent kidney function. He's had Stage IV -- I'm sorry, Stage V renal failure. And he has a permanent fistula implanted to assist with the dialysis treatment. He also has related conditions that kind of spinoff from his kidney problems of sleep disturbance, fatigue, heartburn, inability to exercise,

1.3

2.1

sun sensitivity, jaundice, and some type of problem with his left arm, and dietary restrictions. He also has heartburn.

I'm aware of all those medical conditions.

Probation indicates in their presentence report that according to the Bureau of Prisons, however, his lupus is now in remission on medication. His hypertension is in remission, not requiring medication. He was diagnosed with sleep apnea that was resolved with a foam to elevate the head of his bed. And probation indicates that the records at the institution indicate he has no other medical issues at this time.

He does not require assistance completing his daily living skills. But he does have a serious kidney problem and he is on the list to get a kidney transplant because of that problem.

I would, of course, also note, as Mr. Witherspoon has appointed out, he had these medical problems when he committed the crimes at issue here. According to his record, he went on social security disability in the year 2011 and has not had gainful employment since that date. The indictment here alleges that the crime, the conspiracy, went from 2002 to 2014. But if you dig deeper into the presentence report, Mr. Bethea's involvement began in 2011 and went on to 2013. So he committed this drug trafficking crime while on disability and while he still had this kidney

1.3

2.1

problem that still plagues him today. And so I'm aware of his medical problems.

Regarding his behavior in prison while incarcerated, as we've already said, he only has two minor bumps on his record, one using another inmate's number to make a cell phone call, and another for sending an unauthorized e-mail message, which are extremely lightweight, in my opinion.

He's taken some educational programs, including

National Parenting Program I and II. He's still working on

his GED. He hasn't taken any real vocational training,

primarily, I'm sure, because of his kidney problems. But Mr.

Mackenzie indicates that he has taken a number of educational programs in an effort to get his GED, all of which is commendable.

I've also considered as required the need for the sentence imposed to reflect the seriousness of the offense.

As I said, this is a serious offense, particularly as Mr.

Witherspoon has mentioned numerous times, while the defendant was given the luxury of being out on bond for these pending charges for which he faced a potential life sentence, he used that opportunity to continue to cook crack cocaine in his home when his wife and children were not present, in clear violation of the terms of his release. He was not held accountable for that weight of crack cocaine produced, but it did cause him to lose the discount for acceptance of

responsibility which was three levels. And that translated into a good many additional months of incarceration as indicated by counsel.

I've also considered the need for the sentence

imposed to promote respect for the law. Once again, his behavior while on pretrial release pending trial of cooking crack cocaine certainly does not demonstrate respect for the law. I am also required to consider the need for imposing just punishment and adequate deterrence and the need to protect the public from future crimes of the defendant. I've carefully considered all those factors.

I've also considered the need to avoid unwarranted disparity in the sentences of similarly situated co-defendants. Mr. Bethea's record speaks for his, his conduct. Particularly his behavior while on release pending trial sets him apart from similarly situated co-defendants in terms of his disregard for the law while these charges were pending.

Those are all my reasons. Anything further?

MR. WITHERSPOON: Nothing from the Government, Your

Honor.

1.3

2.1

MR. MACKENZIE: No, sir.

THE COURT: Do you want to take a break and then go into the compassionate release, or do you want to move right into it?

MR. WITHERSPOON: I'm ready. 1 2 MR. MACKENZIE: I'm ready. THE COURT: Let's go right into it then. I guess we 3 need to call on Mr. Mackenzie first then. This is your 4 motion. 5 MR. MACKENZIE: Thank you, Your Honor. Yes, Mr. 6 Bethea filed a pro se motion for compassionate release. I'm 7 glad to address that at this time. 8 THE COURT: Let's just -- Mr. Bethea, do you consent to proceeding with this compassionate release motion on the 10 satellite just as you did with the earlier sentencing 11 hearing? 12 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor. 1.3 THE COURT: I'm not sure he really has a right to be 14 present for it. He doesn't even have a right to a hearing on 15 it, but let's confirm. You are satisfied with going forward 16 with the satellite, Mr. Mackenzie? I'm sorry, Mr. Bethea? 17 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor. 18 THE COURT: Go ahead. Let me hear from you. 19 MR. MACKENZIE: Yes, sir, Your Honor. He's filed a 20 motion for compassionate release alleging extraordinary and 2.1 compelling reasons for his release. Under the statute, he 22 alleges he has a serious physical or medical condition such 23 that he's not able to perform self-care for himself. And he 2.4 suffers from a condition from which he will not recover. 25

1.3

2.1

Again, the medical condition is pretty well-established in the record. I am not to go through that again. Your Honor seems to have a good grasp of that. I would just add that had Mr. Bethea believes that he would receive better medical care if he were released. He would receive better medical care and have a better chance of a kidney transplant if he's released on the outside.

There's also COVID-19 concerns. Of course, we all have that concern. But according to the CDC, kidney disease puts him at a higher risk --

THE COURT: I think you indicated he received his first vaccination when the memo was written. Has he received a second one now?

MR. MACKENZIE: He has, Your Honor. And Mr. Witherspoon mentioned that in his filings. And, yes, in the meantime, he has received his second vaccination. But, nevertheless, the virus affects people in different ways. And there are variants that are coming along, it seems lately. And, again, he's at higher risk because of his known diseases.

He has a release plan. His application for compassionate relief is attached. It's actually attached to the Government's response to Mr. Bethea's petition. Therein it lays out his release plan. He would -- he tells me now he would be living with his mother-in-law here in the Columbia

1.3

2.1

area. He does have a place to go and reside. He would receive medical care at the same place where he had been receiving medical care here in the Columbia area before his incarceration. He will have financial support. As has already been mentioned, he qualifies and was actually receiving social security at one point. That will have to be reactivated, but he does qualify for that.

He tells me that he also has a possible employment opportunity lined up. And I will let him address that, Your Honor.

On the compassionate release, we also had the McCoy decision from the Fourth Circuit, United States v. McCoy.

This is the case -- in the Fourth Circuit opinion in this case, in the Bethea case, the Fourth Circuit referred us to their McCoy decision from last year, and said that Mr. Bethea may be eligible for compassionate release under that decision. And in that decision, the Fourth Circuit said that district court can consider any extraordinary or compelling reason for release, and that the Court is not constrained by the policy statement contained within the sentencing guidelines.

And the Court went on to say that if there is a gross disparity between the prior sentence and what a defendant would be sentenced to under present circumstances, that can be a reason for compassionate release. Congress is

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

```
saying that these Draconian sentences for drug cases are no
longer necessary, but that isn't reason for compassionate
relief. And we do have that in this case where Mr. Bethea
was initially facing a mandatory life sentence and the
quideline range is now 12 1/2 to 15 years, Your Honor.
         THE COURT: But let me jump in here. As Mr.
Witherspoon points out, you already are getting the benefit
of the new law --
         MR. MACKENZIE: Yes, Your Honor.
         THE COURT: -- in this case.
         MR. MACKENZIE: Yes, sir, Your Honor. I was also
going to tell you that it is Mr. Bethea's position on the
compassionate release motion that he be actually released
from confinement.
         THE COURT: I understand that. But you are saying
that McCoy says I can look at intervening changes in
sentencing law. Well, we did when we took the remand from
the Fourth Circuit and did away with 851 enhancements. We
did sentence him under the new more lenient provisions.
Right?
         MR. MACKENZIE: Yes, sir. Now that you made that
ruling, that issue is pretty well resolved.
         THE COURT: All right.
         MR. MACKENZIE: Nevertheless, Mr. Bethea is
requesting release under the statute. Of course, the Court
```

1.3

2.1

is required to make an individual assessment in every case.

And we do have some serious medical conditions in this case

and --

I don't want to sound punitives here, but as I point out earlier, he qualified for complete social security disability back in 2011. And then he committed these crimes after that. And he committed these crimes with his kidney problem, with his dialysis treatments. And so if I would accept that argument, and I don't want to make it sound superficial, but it would almost be like if you have a severe medical problem, you have a get-out-of-jail-free card in your pocket. Because you commit a crime, a serious crime, get a sentence and then turn right around and want to come back out because you've got this medical problem that you had well before you started committing the criminal conduct. I'm just bothered by that.

MR. MACKENZIE: I acknowledge that, Your Honor. I would just add to that that with the passage of time and increase in age, you know, the lupus is not going to go away. These are chronic conditions. The kidney disease is not going to go away. And with his increasing age, you know, this is going to be more and more of a problem for him over time and --

THE COURT: Well, again, just to follow up on that,

I'm supposed to avoid the unwarranted disparity in sentencing

2.1

of similarly situated co-defendants, his co-defendants who did not have severe medical conditions had sentencing they cannot get out from under for medical reasons. That's another matter I need to consider.

MR. MACKENZIE: I would also point out that with the COVID-19 concerns, he is more susceptible if he is to contract further disease or be in serious trouble with the COVID-19 itself. So he's asking that he be released at this time under the compassionate release statute, Your Honor, released to supervised release and home detention.

I believe Mr. Bethea would also like to address the Court on this issue at the appropriate time, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I will hear from him. Mr. Bethea you have a right to make any statement you wish on this motion for compassionate release. I will be glad to hear anything you want to tell me.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor. I just want to read this. Your Honor, I'm here today to ask for mercy on two things. One, if you can go as low as 120 months; two, Your Honor, if you can grant me compassionate release, the rest of my time on home confinement with probation. If you grant me compassionate release, I have a job offer at UPS.

And with that being said, if I'm released, Your

Honor, once I start my dialysis treatment on the street, if

I'm released, they will put me on the kidney transplant list

as soon as possible. I also have family members that might 1 2 have a kidney match. Your Honor, the guy you sentenced in 2015 is not the 3 same guy that's sitting here today. Your Honor, all I ask is 4 for a second chance to be with my wife and children. All I 5 want to do is to work and help my wife to take care of our 6 children. 7 Since my incarceration, I have put my wife and 8 children through a lot by not being present. My children are growing up real fast. And all I can ask is to be with my 10 children's lives (sic), especially my boys. I just want to 11 make sure they don't go down the same path as I did. 12 Your Honor, this has been a learning experience and 1.3 a wake-up call. All I ask is for a second chance to be with 14 my wife and children. I know my wife and children need me as 15 much as I need them. 16 And, again, I'm just asking for your mercy so I 17 could be with my family again. That's it. 18 THE COURT: All right. Thank you, sir. Anything 19 further, Mr. Mackenzie? 20 MR. MACKENZIE: No, Your Honor. 2.1 THE COURT: Mr. Witherspoon? 22 MR. WITHERSPOON: Judge, it sounds like, as I stated 23

in my memo, his two reasons are COVID-19 and FSA. I think as
the Court eluded to, the First Step Act, he was sentenced

1.3

2.1

today as if he was brought in for the first time today. So I think that one is aside. And that has been resolved, as the Court has said.

Other reason is COVID-19. He contends that because of his medical conditions he's more susceptible to COVID-19.

As I pointed out in one of my responses, he was exposed to a person who had COVID-19. He was isolated, quarantined, and showed no signs. Thereafter, now he has been inoculated with both vaccines for COVID-19. That does not say that he won't get it. But according to all the data, as a result of his inoculations, he's more than 90 percent -- I wouldn't say cured. The vaccines are 90 percent good to prevent any serious harmful effects from COVID-19. Even though he was exposed, he did not have the inoculation, now he has the inoculation, and the inoculation are helpful in that regard.

I would point out a couple of things that seem a little odd here. He said that he was going to apply for social security disability. Both he and Mr. Mackenzie says that he has an employment opportunity. He clearly said that he has a job opportunity with UPS. That's not light work. If he's disabled, how in the world is he going to be able to work at UPS?

THE COURT: Well, you can get a job and give up your disability benefits.

MR. WITHERSPOON: He says he's disabled.

THE COURT: Right. Right.

2.1

MR. WITHERSPOON: And he's going to apply for social security. So you can't be disabled today and then tomorrow get a job saying I'm no longer disabled. There's got to be something there.

He wants home confinement, Judge. We gave him home confinement or detention between his guilty plea and his sentencing. But he, nevertheless, continued involvement in his drug dealing.

And he's put his family through a lot, and he certainly has. But his family never was in his consideration during the time he was out on bond.

When you look at his grounds for compassionate release, he doesn't like being in prison. He doesn't like being away from his family. But those were not sufficient to prevent him from continuing in his drug dealing during the time of his bond.

Judge, I would contend that given all the weight, all the considerations that you've heard today, that he has not shown grounds sufficient for compassionate release such that he would be released to home detention from prison. So we ask that you deny his motion.

THE COURT: Anything in reply?

MR. MACKENZIE: I don't have anything else, Your Honor. Thank you.

2.1

THE COURT: Give me one second. All right. On the record before me, I'm constrained to deny the motion for compassionate release. First of all, as Mr. Witherspoon pointed out, pursuant to the *McCoy* case, the defendant has already been given the benefit of the new sentencing laws that have gone on the books since his original sentence. And he was sentenced under the First Step Act and the 851 enhancements went away. And that substantially reduced his sentencing exposure from a life sentence down to just over 16 years, I think 16 1/2 years, approximately, at the high end of the guidelines.

I'm aware of the terrible problems in the prisons occasioned by the COVID-19 pandemic, but Mr. Witherspoon in his memorandum has documented all of the corrective measures that the bureau has taken to provide for safety and security there during the pandemic. When the defendant was exposed to someone who tested positive, he was given -- he was taken away, and thankfully did not suffer from that. He's now received both vaccines which are supposed to be at least 90 percent effective for preventing the disease.

I'm certainly aware that his lupus problems and kidney problems make him much more susceptible to bad results while in prison. I'm fully aware of that. But I cannot get away from the fact that his behavior while on pretrial release pending trial in this case, he used the opportunity

to go back to cooking crack cocaine in his home when his wife 1 and children were not present. 2 So what I'm saying is, I think I cannot conclude 3 that he would not be a danger to the community if released. 4 I think there's a severe possibility that he could revert to 5 his old ways of criminal misbehavior, serious criminal 6 misbehavior in terms of drug distribution. And he would, 7 therefore, be a threat to the community if released. 8 So I acknowledge he has lupus and needs a kidney. He gets dialysis treatment three times a week at the Bureau 10 of Prisons. Hopefully, the COVID-19 pandemic will begin to 11 subside. He's gotten both vaccinations. I'm just not 12 convinced that he's demonstrated extraordinary and compelling 1.3 circumstances. And I think the Government has demonstrated 14 he would be a threat to the community if released. 15 So for all those reasons, the request for 16 compassionate release is respectfully denied. 17 Anything further? 18 MR. WITHERSPOON: Nothing from the Government, Your 19 20 Honor. MR. MACKENZIE: No, sir, Your Honor. 2.1 THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much. 22 Appreciate the technology help, Kurt. We didn't have any 23 satellite drops. And we had good audio and visual. We will 24 be in recess.

25

(Whereupon, proceedings are adjourned.) CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER I, Karen V. Andersen, Registered Merit Reporter, Certified Realtime Reporter for the State of South Carolina at Large, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript is a true, accurate and complete Transcript of Record of the proceedings. I further certify that I am neither related to nor counsel for any party to the cause pending or interested in the events thereof. Andersen Registered Merit Reporter Certified Realtime Reporter